

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/507,185	ICHIKAWA, YUKIHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NATASHA YOUNG	1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NATASHA YOUNG.

(3) MOSHE WILENSKY.

(2) WALTER GRIFFIN.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 13 August 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 15-23.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ogawa et al (US 4,568,402 and, Kasai et al (US 5,720,787)).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner argued that there was no distinct difference between plugging the cells of the honeycomb structure and shielding the cells with an outer peripheral wall. Applicant believes that there are structural and mechanical benefits of shielding cells through use of an outer peripheral wall.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.